



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,493	02/06/2002	Yoshiharu Dewa	7217/66541	1862

7590 03/22/2004

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,493

Applicant(s)

DEWA ET AL.

Examiner

ANTHONY J BLACKMAN

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Graphical User Interface Utilizing A Plurality Of Node Processing Means For View/Drawing; Including Analysis, Selection, Display Control, View Generation And View Re-Generation.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by HOPCROFT et al, US Patent No. 6,154,215.
4. As per claim 1, examiner interprets HOPCROFT et al to disclose;
A display controlling method based on a program code including a view and a node
(column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45-47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1,

Art Unit: 2676

6, 8 and 10-12), said method comprising the steps of: selecting a view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45-55, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and displaying on a display screen (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45-55, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), an image corresponding to a node specified by said selected view in a drawing style specified by said view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45-47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), wherein a node includes a data group indicating a static attribute of one of (the following underlined conditional feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) a link to referential data and actual referential data, and includes a constitutive unit of a drawing, and a view includes a group of data for specifying that said node generates said drawing in a drawing style displayed on said display screen, corresponding to said node (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

5. As per claim 2, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations of claim 1, and also discloses the further comprising the step of determining a subsequent view to be selected according to an operation performed according to said display screen (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

6. As per claim 3, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, further comprising the step of generating another view in accordance with an operation history (figure 8, column 7, line 53-column 8, line 17).

7. As per claim 4, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 3, further comprising the step of selecting and displaying said other view (figure 8, column 7, line 53-column 8, line 17).

8. As per claim 5, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of: analyzing said program (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); generating a tree structure information of said node and said view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and based on said tree structure (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), selecting said view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), carrying out processing for said displaying operation (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), and determining another view to be selected (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

Art Unit: 2676

9. As per claim 7, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, wherein said node further indicates an attribute of said referential data (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

10. As per claim 8, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, wherein said program code further includes a data group indicating inter-relationships between said plurality of nodes (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

11. As per claim 9, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, wherein said program code further includes a data group indicating a mode of transition of said views. (Column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

12. As per claim 10, examiner interprets HOPCRAFT et al to disclose a program comprising the steps of: selecting a view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and displaying an image corresponding to a node specified by said selected view in a drawing style specified by said view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), wherein said steps
Are performed based on another program specifying that a plurality of said nodes each serving as a data group indicate a static attribute of one of a (the following underlined

Art Unit: 2676

conditional features correspond to the computer modeling and visual displaying means - column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) a link to referential data and actual referential data, and includes a constitutive unit of a drawing, and a plurality of said views each serving as a data group for specifying said node generating said drawing in a drawing style of a display, corresponding to said node (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

13. As per claim 11, HOPCROFT et al meets limitations of claim 10, further comprising the step of determining a subsequent view to be selected according to an operation carried out by a user in accordance with said display (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

14. As per claim 12, HOPCROFT et al meets limitations of claim 10, further comprising the step of generating another view in accordance with an operation history of said user (figure 8, column 7, line 53-column 8, line 17).

15. As per claim 13, HOPCROFT et al meets limitations of claim 12, further comprising the step of selecting and displaying said other view (figure 8, column 7, line 53-column 8, line 17).

16. As per claim 14, examiner interprets HOPCROFT et al to meet limitations of claim 14; A computer-processed program for display control, comprising: a plurality of

nodes each serving as a data group indicating a static attribute of one of a link to referential data and actual referential data and each serving as a constitutive unit of a drawing (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and a plurality of views each serving as a data group for specifying that said node carries out said drawing in a drawing style on a display corresponding to said node (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

17. As per claim 15, examiner interprets HOPCROFT et al to meet limitations of claim 15; A display controlling apparatus comprising: a memory unit for storing a program including a plurality of nodes each serving as a data group indicating a static attribute of one of a link to referential data and actual referential data and each serving as a constitutive unit of a drawing (the following underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) a link to referential data and actual referential data, and includes a constitutive unit of a drawing, and a plurality of views each serving as a data group for specifying that said node carries out said drawing in a drawing style on a screen of the node; a program analyzer for analyzing said program and generating a tree structure information of said node and said view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); a view selecting means for selecting a view based on said tree structure information and a display operation (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); a display controller for controlling display so that

an image corresponding to said node specified by said selected view is displayed under said drawing style specified by said selected view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), based on said tree structure information (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and a view generator for generating another view based on an operation history (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

18. As per claim 16, examiner interprets HOPCROFT et al to meet limitations of claim 16; A display controlling method comprising the steps of: selecting a view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and displaying an image corresponding to a node specified by said selected view in a drawing style specified by said selected view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), wherein said Steps are performed based on a program (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66 and column 4, lines 1-51, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) including:

A plurality of said nodes each serving as a data group indicating one of a (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) static attribute of a link to referential data and actual referential data for displaying one of (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and

Art Unit: 2676

45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) an image for operation of a plurality of electronic apparatuses and an image for showing status of said electronic apparatuses, and each of said nodes serving as a constitutive unit of a drawing; and a plurality of said views each serving as a data group for specifying (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12): wherein said node performing said drawing in a drawing style corresponding to said node column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

18. As per claim 18, examiner interprets HOPCROFT et al to meet the following limitations of claim 18, A program for instructing a computer to perform the following steps of: selecting a view (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12); and displaying an image corresponding to a node specified by Said selected view in a drawing style specified by said selected view (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), wherein said steps are performed based on a program (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) including: a plurality of said nodes (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) each :serving as a data group indicating a static attribute (column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) of one of (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the

Art Unit: 2676

computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) a link to referential data and actual referential data for displaying one of an image for operation of a plurality of electronic apparatuses and an image for showing status of said electronic apparatuses, and each of said nodes serving as a constitutive unit of a drawing; and a plurality of said views each serving as a data group for specifying: wherein said node performing said drawing in a drawing style corresponding to said node (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 8, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HOPCROFT et al, US Patent No. 6,154,215 in view of ISHIKAWA, US Patent No. 6,483,508.

21. As per claim 6. HOPCROFT et al meet limitations according to claim 1, however, does not expressly teach or suggest a network means, wherein said referential data comprises one of an image data, an audio data, and a text data stored in a communication apparatus connected to a network. ISHIKAWA, US Patent No.

6,483,508 discloses said network means as claimed (figure 1-network system, figure 3, elements 51-52 operate in conjunction with the network, and column 7, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art the time of the invention to utilize the network means, for at least expanded intercommunications and linkage means, i.e., local area network for (improved) information processing (column 5, lines 34-50) "which hierarchically displays nodes"...as a prototype using all or some of the displayed nodes of the hierarchically displayed current scope (column 3, lines 29-41)" of ISHIKAWA to modify the "...method for creating and maintaining and maintaining a dual scene graph for the display of a computer generated object. The user creates a user scene graph which has a number of node[s] in a hierarchical organization which represents an object (abstract, lines 1-4)" of HOPCROFT et al because both inventions share similar technological environments corresponding to graphical display through hierarchical node processing and the addition of ISHIKAWA improves graphical user interface means expanding "graphics data (column 7, lines 50-54)" via the network system of ISHIKAWA.

22. As per claim 17, HOPCROFT et al, meet limitations of claim 16, further comprising: and displaying on a screen one of (the following conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12) an image for operation and an image showing status of said plurality of electronic apparatuses corresponding to said plurality of nodes specified by said selected view (the following

conditional underlined feature corresponds to the computer modeling and visual displaying means -column 2, line 44-column 3, line 4 and 45--47, 55-66, figures 1, 6, 8 and 10-12), however, does not expressly teach said view specifying nodes corresponding to said plurality of electronic apparatuses. ISHIKAWA suggest said view specifying nodes corresponding to said plurality of electronic apparatuses via communication network means (figure 1-network system, figure 3, elements 51-52 operate in conjunction with the network, and column 7, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art the time of the invention to utilize the network means, for at least expanded intercommunications and linkage means, i.e., local area network for (improved) information processing (column 5, lines 34-50) "which hierarchically displays nodes"... as a prototype using all or some of the displayed nodes of the hierarchically displayed current scope (column 3, lines 29-41)" of ISHIKAWA to modify the "...method for creating and maintaining and maintaining a dual scene graph for the display of a computer generated object. The user creates a user scene graph which has a number of node[s] in a hierarchical organization which represents an object (abstract, lines 1-4)" of HOPCROFT et al because both inventions share similar technological environments corresponding to graphical display through hierarchical node processing and the addition of ISHIKAWA improves graphical user interface means expanding "graphics data (column 7, lines 50-54)" via the network system of ISHIKAWA.

23. As per claim 19, HOPCROFT et al meet limitations of claim 18, further comprising: and displaying on one screen one of an image for operation and an image

Art Unit: 2676

for showing status of said plurality of electronic apparatuses corresponding to said plurality of nodes specified by said selected view. ISHIKAWA suggests said selected view specifying nodes corresponding to said plurality of electronic apparatuses (Figure 1-network system, figure 3, elements 51-52 operates in conjunction with the network, and column 7, lines 51-55).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art the time of the invention to utilize the network means, for at least expanded intercommunications and linkage means, i.e., local area network for (improved) information processing (column 5, lines 34-50) "which hierarchically displays nodes" ... as a prototype using all or some of the displayed nodes of the hierarchically displayed current scope (column 3, lines 29-41)" of ISHIKAWA to modify the "...method for creating and maintaining and maintaining a dual scene graph for the display of a computer generated object. The user creates a user scene graph which has a number of node[s] in a hierarchical organization which represents an object (abstract, lines 1-4)" of HOPCROFT et al because both inventions share similar technological environments corresponding to graphical display through hierarchical node processing and the addition of ISHIKAWA improves graphical user interface means expanding "graphics data (column 7, lines 50-54)" via the network system of ISHIKAWA.

Conclusion


24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following prior art corresponds to user display and


manipulation of hierarchical nodes: SAMRA, US Patent No. 6,683,619; MARTINO et al, US Patent No. 6,486,898; LIOU et al, US Patent No. 6,278,446; KU et al, US Patent No. 6,462,762; and MEISEL, US Patent No. 5,297,253.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J BLACKMAN whose telephone number is 703-305-0833. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday between the hours of 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ANTHONY J BLACKMAN
Examiner
Art Unit 2676


MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600